



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,506	03/09/2004	Jeffery M. Enright	D-1243	1933
28995	7590	02/01/2007	EXAMINER	
RALPH E. JOCKE walker & jockey LPA 231 SOUTH BROADWAY MEDINA, OH 44256			RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2621	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/01/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/796,506	ENRIGHT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Andy S. Rao	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/09/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                         |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because figure 15 fails to show the "oscillator" and "suitable vibration circuitry" as described in the specification on page 34, lines 5-22; page 35, lines 1-22; page 36, lines 1-10. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Magee et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Magee").

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Magee discloses a method (Magee: figure 16) comprising: capturing with an imaging device (Magee: column 7, lines 15-25), first image data corresponding to an image of at least a portion of a user interface of an automated banking machine that includes a cash dispenser (Magee: column 15, lines 45-55), and storing the first image data in at least one data store through operation of at least one processor (Magee: column 15, lines 1-10); subsequent to, capturing with the image device, second image data corresponding to an image of at least a portion of the user interface of the automated banking machine (Magee: column 15, lines 20-35); comparing the first image data and the second image data through operation of at least one processor to determine if there is at least a level of change between the first and second image data (Magee: column 56-67); responsive to determining at least the level of change, taking at least one programmed action responsive to operation of the at least one processor (Magee: column 16, lines 1-15), as in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Magee discloses wherein the portion of the user interface includes a card accepting opening (Magee: column 14, lines 40-45), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 3-4, Magee discloses wherein the at least one response includes sending at least one message to at least one remote system address (Magee: column 15, lines 55-58), as in the claims.

Regarding claims 5-7, Magee discloses executing at least one test to determine if an unauthorized card reading device has been installed (Magee: column 14, lines 40-45 & 55-60), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 8, Magee discloses rendering the machine inoperative (Magee: column 1-10), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 9-12, Magee discloses detecting at least one triggering event responsive to operation of the at least one processor, wherein the comparing is performed responsive to the triggering event (Magee: column 15, lines 25-35), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 13, Magee discloses wherein in the triggering event includes sensing opening of a shutter previously blocking a card accepting slot (Magee: column 16, lines 45-60), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 14-16, Magee discloses wherein the at least one triggering event includes an input to at least one key on the user interface of the machine at a time not appropriate in operation of the machine (Magee: column 7, lines 15-25), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 17, Magee discloses that the at least one triggering event includes the machine presenting cash to a user that is not taken by the user (Magee: column 13, lines 35-46), as in the claim.

Art Unit: 2621

Regarding claim 18, Magee discloses that the triggering event includes at least one user not taking a transaction receipt provided by the machine (Magee: column 13, lines 35-47), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 19, Magee discloses that the triggering event includes the machine being able to satisfactorily complete a plurality of transactions (Magee: column 16, lines 1-12), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 20-26, Magee discloses causing the at least one processor to execute at least one action in a programmed sequence corresponding to the triggering event (Magee: column 16, lines 1-17), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 27, Magee discloses an article bearing computer executable instructions operative to cause at least one processor to carry out the method as specified (Magee: column 24, lines 24-57), as in the claim.

### *Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Aviv discloses an abnormality detection and surveillance system. Doig discloses a fraud prevention arrangement. Mair discloses a self service terminal. Anderson discloses a debit card fraud detection and control system.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andy S. Rao  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2621

asr  
January 31, 2007

ANDY RAO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER